

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/723,926	TURNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arlen Soderquist	1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arlen Soderquist. (3) _____.

(2) Brian Klein. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 December 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 163 and 178.

Identification of prior art discussed: the art of record generally.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed amendments to claim 163 regarding the pressure. Examiner indicated that it appears that the specific limitation proposed is not taught by the applied references. Also indicated that one question that will need to be answered is if the valving systems taught by the references inherently meet the proposed pressure limitation. Examiner indicated that claim 178 was not properly rejected in the final office action. Examiner indicated that should a rejection be appropriate for either claim 163 or claim 178, the finality will be withdrawn and a new office action issued.